

(Charles)

MR. FLOYER'S CASE

IN THE

LATE DISPUTES AT MADRAS.

MR. Floyer landed at Madras from England, on the 3d of June, 1776, having been appointed of Council at Fort St. George, and nominated by the Court of Directors to succeed Mr. Whitehill in the chiefship of Masulipatam, of which the President and Council were duly advised, in a general letter from the Company, by the Royal Henry Indiaman, which arrived from England on the 1st or 2d of the preceding month of May.

On the 6th of June, being duly summoned, Mr. Floyer took his seat in the Council, and the oaths of allegiance and office, at which Council there was no material business moved or transacted.

At the succeeding council, held on the 10th of that month, the business of the day commenced with the perusal of the following minute, delivered by Mr. Floyer.

Minute of Mr. Floyer, respecting the propriety and necessity of giving his opinion on Mr. Benfield's claims. Consultation, 10th June, 1776.

“The board being this day assembled, to re-consider a resolution on a subject that has been a long time under deliberation, Mr. Floyer begs leave to submit to their consideration the particulars of his situation, relative to the chiefship of Masulipatam, of which he is appointed, by the honourable Court of Directors, to take *immediate* charge, in case of the death, resignation, or removal of Mr. Whitehill, who took his departure for Europe three months ago: and to *know* whether it is their opinion, that it is proper for him, as chief of a subordination, to assist at their consultations during his stay at the Presidency.—When Mr. Floyer is informed of the board's sentiments on this occasion, he will be

A

better

better able to judge whether he shall confine his attention chiefly to the business of his particular department, Masulipatam, or divide it between that, and such matters as may come under the deliberation of this board.—Mr. Floyer further informs the board, that as the question now before them appears to be of a very important nature*, and has already much engaged the attention of the right honourable President, and the other members, he cannot flatter himself with the expectation of becoming a competent judge of a matter, upon which the opinion to be given should, he thinks, be the result of information and local knowledge, obtained in its every progressive stage.—Thus situated, he wishes to decline giving any vote on the occasion; and informs the board, that if they should be of opinion his voice is necessary, he shall proceed in giving it with the utmost diffidence and concern, for the reasons he has already stated."

Mr. Floyer thought it incumbent on him not to delay offering these his sentiments to the board, for the following reasons :

1st,—Because his duty first called him to take *immediate* charge of the settlement of Masulipatam, which had been near *three months* vacated by Mr. Whitehill, in obedience to the *express* and *positive* orders of the Court of Directors, transmitted by the Royal Henry Indiaman.

2dly,—Because no notice had been taken by the President and Council at the preceding consultation, 6th June, of his said nomination to the chief ship of Masulipatam.

And 3dly,—Because he was informed that a matter of great importance, which had been determined by the Council, consisting of the President and ten other members, previous to his arrival, was to be reconsidered on that day, (10th June.)

Copy of the 24th paragraph of the Company's general letter to Fort St. George, by the ship Royal Henry, dated November 24, 1775.

" Mr. Charles Floyer, whom, by our letter of the 12th of April last, we appointed one of the Council, at your Presidency, now pro-

* To determine a matter of property to a very great amount.

ceeds to his station on the ship Greenwich; and *we direct* that in case of a *vacancy* in the chiefship of Masulipatam, by the decease, *resignation*, or *coming away* of Mr. John Whitehill, Mr. Floyer do *immediately* succeed *thereto*; it being our *intention*, and we do hereby direct, that Mr. Floyer shall be the next chief of that subordinate to Mr. Whitehill; and, that in case of resignation, death, or removal of Mr. Whitehill, before the receipt of this letter, our *positive* orders are, that Mr. Floyer do, *on his arrival*, take *immediate* charge of the *chiefship* of Masulipatam."

Nothing can possibly be more expressive of the intention and *positive* orders of the Court of Directors, for Mr. Floyer's proceeding *immediately* to his station at Masulipatam, in case of its being vacated by his predecessor, Mr. Whitehill, than the words repeatedly used in the foregoing paragraph of their orders—It remains to be shewn in what manner these orders operated with the President and Council, to whom they were addressed.

The resolution of the President and Council, in reply to Mr. Floyer's minute of the 10th of June, is as follows :

" Mr. Floyer not having been present at the discussion of this subject, it is agreed that the reconsideration of it be deferred until Thursday next," 13th June.

It should seem that the President and Council, by their foregoing resolution, had totally lost sight of Mr. Floyer's request, and that they did not sufficiently attend to the express and positive orders of their honourable masters. But as this resolution was vague and undecisive, Mr. Floyer again addressed them by letter, which he delivered at the council table on the 13th June.

To the right honourable Lord Pigot, President and Governor,
&c. Council at Fort St. George.

My Lord and Gentlemen,

" Permit me to have the honour of representing to you, that after having read with all the attention in my power, the several papers and proceedings which are connected with the question at pre-

present under the consideration of the board, I do not, in my own mind, find myself competent to give an opinion upon it, without that degree of doubt that probably might, through life, affect my future peace of mind.

“ There is, in my opinion, a wide difference between the degrees of knowledge gained by the private and separate perusal of papers, on any important subject, in its last stage, and that sort of information which a man of candour may require, who has had occasion to be present during the whole course of the operations tending to those debates ; or who, as a member of Council, has had and personally taken a share in the progressive reasoning upon them.

“ Thus much, upon the whole, I apprehend, and most sensibly feel, that my doubtful vote may possibly *involve this Presidency* in great difficulties with the country powers ; or it may affect the property and credit of individuals, and in its consequences entail many inconveniencies upon this settlement.

“ I am the more agitated by this impression on my mind, because, that if the orders of the honourable Court of Directors, in any respect are to be conformed to, I presume my duty calls me *immediately* to my station at Masulipatam ; so that if I give my vote, as is possible, erroneously on this occasion, it may not *afterwards* be in my power to *remedy* the inconvenience upon any future discussion at the board on this subject. I entertain that opinion of your lordship, and of the other members of Council, who have thoroughly weighed and considered the question now before you, with all its consequences, some time before my arrival, that I am convinced every member will give his voice as the result of information and local knowledge, he has acquired of this matter, in its every progressive stage.—This, it must be confessed, my Lord and Gentlemen, cannot be my case ; and, therefore, I trust I shall stand excused to my honourable masters, to your lordship, and to the other members of the board, if I wish to decline giving any opinion in the situation and circumstances I have herein stated to you.

“ However, conscious as I am that my private feelings ought to give way to what the board may think my duty to my honourable masters, I await the sentiments of your lordship and council on this occasion,

occasion, to which I profess myself at all times ready to pay the utmost deference and respect.

I have the honour to be,

My lord and gentlemen,

your most obedient humble servant,

Fort St. George,
June 13th, 1776.

C. F———.”

Upon this letter having been read, a warm debate ensued in Council; the President, lord Pigot, and other members, insisting that Mr. Floyer, as well as every other member present, was bound to give his vote upon every question agitated in Council, and the following standing orders of the Company were quoted in support of their arguments.

Extract from a general letter from England, dated Feb. 15, 1705.

Paragraph 97.—“ If, at any time, any of the Council at Fort St. George should be appointed by us, or the President and Council for the time being, to be chief of a subordinate factory, and there is no declaration to the contrary, such chief, if he happen at any time to be at Fort St. George, shall take place in the Council, as he would have done had he remained all the while at Madras; such sitting in Council being designed as a proper honorary station to preserve the person's reputation.”

Mr. Floyer must ever think the only interpretation that ought to have been put upon this paragraph was, that a chief of a subordinate might attend and give his vote in Council, when at the Presidency, more as a compliment necessary for keeping up the rank such member held in the service, than the compelling him to give a vote, when such reasons existed as had been given by Mr. Floyer for wishing to decline it—But finding that Sir Robert Fletcher only was of the same opinion, he thought it his duty to acquiesce.

Mr. Floyer's opinion is recorded at length in the proceedings of Council on the 14th of June, 1776, as entered in the 237th page of the first volume of papers, printed in the year 1777, by order of the Court of Directors, to which he begs leave to refer.

B

It

It may not perhaps be unnecessary to set forth the very singular predicament in which Mr. Floyer was placed, by having been thus compelled to vote upon the important question, at that time before the Board.

When this question was first agitated and determined in Council, on the 29th of May, 1776, before Mr. Floyer's arrival, it was carried by a majority of six to five, viz. the President, Messrs. Brooke, Dawson, Russell, Dalrymple, and Stone; against Mr. Stratton, Sir Robert Fletcher, Messrs. Palmer, Jourdan, and Mackay—But Mr. Brooke did at the next meeting of Council, on the 3d of June, 1776, declare he had misunderstood the nature of the question, and that he then entertained an opinion different from what he had before given upon it—He thereupon desired and obtained a reconsideration of it.—Thus the question, which had been carried before Mr. Floyer's arrival in India, was, upon reconsideration, certain of being over-ruled by a change of Mr. Brooke's former opinion; by which means the numbers would, vice versa, be six against, and five for the question under reconsideration.

If then Mr. Floyer gave an opinion thereon, and that opinion was for the question, the President would have carried it by his casting vote—Thus the member just arrived from England, unacquainted, as Mr. Floyer had declared himself to be, with the rise and progress of the claims in question upon the Tanjore country, must have been the person to decide ultimately upon a point which the whole Council had deemed of the first consequence, as it determined a matter of property to a very considerable amount—On the other hand, if Mr. Floyer gave his vote against the question, it was of no avail, because, independent of him, there was a declared majority on that side.—

Hence it is evident, that Lord Pigot, and those who supported him in that question, were not the more exposed to a hazard of losing their question, by insisting on Mr. Floyer's vote; but on the other hand, had a chance of carrying their point, if that vote should be favourable to the side of the question they had espoused.

It must therefore be apparent, that Mr. Floyer, by voting as he did against the question, and studiously endeavouring to avoid entering into the debates of the Council, which had risen to a serious height before he landed in India, can neither be charged with a wanton exercise

ercise of the powers vested in him, as a member of the Company's government, or with attaching himself to the one or the other party in the Council.—The public records, at this very period, will clearly demonstrate this impartiality in Mr. Floyer's conduct—for the first vote he gave in the Madras Council, on the * 13th of June, 1776, was in favour of a question put by the President, lord Pigot, in which he concurred in opinion with his lordship, Messrs. Dawson, Brooke, Russell, Dalrymple, and Stone; which proves that Mr. Floyer had not taken a decided part in opposition to lord Pigot.

But Mr. Floyer conceives it will be no difficult matter to prove the decided part which lord Pigot took against him, from the very instant he had given his vote against his lordship's question, on the 13th of June, 1776, touching the claims upon the Tanjore country.

Mr. Floyer, immediately after having given the vote he had been compelled to give, did, on the 14th of June, 1776, again express his earnest wish to the Board, that they would come to the resolution of *obeying* the *positive* orders of the Court of Directors, for his repairing *immediately* to his station at Masulipatam—upon which occasion, the President, lord Pigot, addressing himself to Mr. Floyer, declared that he should look upon *any* man as *his* enemy, who *dared* to give his vote *against* him at *that* Board; and that in case any place of *trust* or emolument in the service became *vacant*, such person should never be appointed thereto, if he could *possibly* prevent it—That as Mr. Floyer had done so, he should most *certainly* do every thing in *his* power to prevent his nomination to *Masulipatam* from taking place—or words to that effect—Mr. Floyer hoped his lordship would have no objection to the secretary's recording the doctrine he had thus held towards the members of the Council, in order that he might reply thereto, and submit the subject to the consideration of the Board: and his lordship replying he had no objection, it was recorded upon his paper of minutes, notwithstanding Mr. Brooke, one of the members present, had previously requested of his lordship, to reflect upon the consequence of such a declaration standing upon record—the Board, however, upon an apology from lord Pigot, fol-

* Printed collection of papers from the India House, vol. i. page 229.

lowed

lowed by the request of Mr. Floyer, immediately afterwards assented to its being expunged—Mr. Floyer appeals for the veracity of these assertions to Mr. Richard Joseph Sullivan (now in England), who was the secretary, and took the minutes of that day's council.

At the time when it was thus agreed to expunge from the records the extraordinary declaration so made by lord Pigot, it was Mr. Floyer's intention never to resume that subject: nor would even the subsequent conduct of lord Pigot have excited him to mention it, but that he finds the matter has been completely disclosed from another quarter, without his participation or knowledge—He observes that it is particularly stated in the printed collection of papers, published by order of the Court of Directors, vol. ii. page 105, in a letter from Mr. Brooke to the Chairman of the Court of Directors.

After the foregoing declaration had been omitted out of the records, Mr. Floyer resumed, with a more earnest solicitation, the subject of his nomination from the Court of Directors to Masulipatam, perceiving too plainly, from what had passed in the course of that consultation, an intention to defeat, if possible, it's operating with effect—Upon this occasion, the President, lord Pigot, informed the Board, that he wished Mr. Floyer's appointment should be deferred for a *few* days, as he had many complaints to lay before them, against persons who had been in the management of the public affairs, at the Northern settlements; and until Mr. Floyer was made acquainted with them, he would not wish to see *him*, or any man of honour, in charge of the settlement of Masulipatam.

As his lordship promised to lay those complaints before the board in a *few* days, the Council concurred in the proposed delay—This passed in consultation the 14th of June, 1776.

On the 21st of June, lord Pigot laid before the Council a draft of a general letter, which he proposed should be written to the Court of Directors—As that letter contained the united sentiments of lord Pigot and Mr. Dalrymple, in whose hand it was written: As no mention was therein made of the Company's orders, respecting Mr. Floyer's appointment to Masulipatam, or even of his arrival in India; and as eight days had elapsed without any appearance of the President's bringing forth the promised complaints, Mr. Floyer had
more

more than cause for suspecting, that a party in the Council was forming, to prevent his going to Masulipatam, notwithstanding the Court of Directors had so positively commanded, that he should proceed *immediately* on his arrival to that station, in case it had been vacated by Mr. Whitehill.

He therefore again moved the Council to come to a determination upon those orders, representing it as most proper, that the Court of Directors should be informed by that conveyance, either from the President and Council, or from himself, whether his said appointment should or should not take place, in the manner their masters had been pleased to direct—This at length produced a resolution of the members of Council, at least of a great majority of them, for confirming Mr. Floyer's appointment, which was accordingly notified to the Court of Directors, and to the Council at Masulipatam, informing them that Mr. Floyer should soon proceed to take charge of that settlement.

This resolution of the Board, though in strict conformity to the positive orders of the Court of Directors, was objected to in Council by lord Pigot and Mr. Dalrymple.—They both informed the Board, they would deliver their opinions in writing upon the occasion, but which they never did.

Lord Pigot, though reminded by some of the members of Council, almost at every meeting subsequent to that of the 14th June, and more particularly by Mr. Stratton and Mr. Brooke, who had been chiefs of northern settlements, of his promise to produce the complaints in question; yet his lordship did not think proper to pay any attention thereto, until the 9th of August following, when he produced, in Council, a petition from Loll Doss, a soucar, or banker, at Masulipatam, together with a draft of a letter addressed to Mr. Floyer and the Council at Masulipatam, and proposed that he should take the letter and petition with him thither.

That letter, in which the purport of the petition is recorded, is to be found in the printed collection of papers, vol. ii. page 407; from whence it will appear, that those complaints afforded no sufficient ground for the pretence of delaying Mr. Floyer's departure for his chiefship of Masulipatam.

Opinions may perhaps differ concerning lord Pigot's motives, not only in his determined purpose of compelling Mr. Floyer

to give his vote, and thus to take a part in the debates of Council at Madras, but in his lordship's perseverance in detaining, by various pretexts, Mr. Floyer from the station to which he was so expressly and positively called by the Court of Directors.

But from lord Pigot's declaration at the Council Board, so early as within ten days of the arrival of Mr. Floyer in India, immediately upon his having given a vote against his question, and other facts herein related, Mr. Floyer doubts not to be fully justified in asserting, that his Lordship was actuated by a personal resentment against him, for having done what he thought was his duty, and for having executed the trust reposed in him, as a faithful servant of the Company, unawed by the improper degree of authority which the President had on so many occasions assumed.

However, after having detained Mr. Floyer two months from his station and duty at Masulipatam, and having sufficiently involved him in the transactions of the Council at Madras, to endanger his incurring the displeasure of his employers; if his lordship's representations could produce that effect, lord Pigot did at length propose, that Mr. Floyer should repair to his station.

It may not be amiss to trace, as briefly as possible, *the situation of public affairs* at the Presidency, at the time when he proposed the departure of Mr. Floyer.

The President, lord Pigot, had threatened the Nabob * with placing an European guard upon *his house*, to keep him a prisoner in his own power.

† He had refused to put a *previous question*, moved by a member in Council, *he considering it an innovation*; although he, the President, had availed himself of such a privilege ‡ vested in a member, by putting a previous question of his own, at a preceding Council, held on the 14th of June, 1776.

* Nabob's Letter to Sir Edward Hughes, dated 3d June 1776, entered in consultation that day. Vol. I. Page 183, of the printed collection of papers from the India House.

† Consultation, 28th June 1776. Vol. II. page 349. of the said printed collection of papers.

‡ Vol. I. page 236. of the said printed collection of papers.

He had refused to put a question to the Board, moved by a member in Council †.

He had declared, that no person but *himself* could agitate a question at the Board; and who, if a question should be proposed which *to him* should appear productive of bad consequences, had an *undoubted* right to prevent the question being put *.

He had asserted a right to adjourn the Council of his own authority, contrary to the opinion of a majority in Council †.

He had asserted, that a resolution of a majority in Council could not be carried into execution, without the concurrence of him, the President ‡.

|| A motion had been made by Mr. Jourdan, a member in Council, for the departure of the Committee of Circuit, in conformity to the orders of the Court of Directors, dated the 25th of April, 1775.

§ Mr. Brooke, another member, had in Council moved a time for the departure of the Committee of Circuit, which was strongly opposed by the President, lord Pigot, and three other members of Council; and, from various obstructions from day to day, that motion was not determined until the 5th of August, 1776 **.

Mr. Ruffel, one of the opponents of Mr. Brooke's motion, who was nominated a member of that Committee by the Court of Directors, in their said orders of the 25th of April, 1775, and had become the senior member, or President of that Board, by the departure of Mr. Dawson for England ††, declared he could not possibly get ready to proceed on *that* duty before the first of October following, which was a month beyond the last period fixed by the

† Consultation, 8th July 1776. Vol. I. page 318. of the said printed collection of papers.

• Vol. I. page 320.

† Minute of the Majority. Consultation, 9th July 1776. Vol. I. page 326. of the said printed collection of papers.

‡ Ditto.

|| Consultation, 26th July 1776. Vol. II. page 360. of the said printed collection of papers.

§ Consultation, 1st August 1776. Vol. II. page 380. of the said printed collection of papers.

** Vol. II. page 398.

†† Consultation, 5th August 1776. Vol. II. page 397.

Board of Council for his departure.—Mr. Russell ††, in his letter to the President and Council, dated 2d August 1776, (only three days before he made that declaration,) had expressed his desire of going to *Tanjore*.

* Mr. Dalrymple, another member of Council, and of the Committee of Circuit, appointed by the same authority as Mr. Russell had been; and who had also opposed the said motions of Mr. Jourdan and Mr. Brooke, thought the Board *ought* to conform to the convenience of Mr. Russell, as far as to allow him till the 1st of October.

† And lord Pigot, regardless of the order of the Court of Directors, had given it as his opinion, that the Committee of Circuit ought not to proceed at all, *until he should think proper*.

‡ The President, lord Pigot, considering his own responsibility, had thought himself warranted to *require* that Mr. Russell should forthwith proceed to *Tanjore* to quiet the mind of the Rajah, notwithstanding a great majority of the Council had resolved that there was no necessity for that member's going thither, and that he should proceed, in conformity to his appointment from the Court of Directors, upon his duty in the Committee of Circuit.

§ The President had made two motions in Council; one for the calling up of two members of the Council from their northern chiefships, to take their seats at the Board: || the other, that if upon enquiry, it should appear that the *nocturnal* visits mentioned by Mr. Russell in his letter to the Board, dated 2d of August 1776, to have been made by the Nabob's sons to the members of Council, such member be suspended from the Company's service until their pleasure should be known.—** And on the President being called upon by Mr. Floyer in Council, to produce the names of any members whom he might have to accuse of any offence, his lordship replied,

†† Consultation, 2d August 1776. Vol. II. page 382.

* Consultation, 5th August 1776. Vol. II. Page 398.

† Ibid. Ibid.

‡ Consultation, 5th August 1776. Vol. II. Page 396.

§ Consultation, 5th August 1776. Vol. II. Page 399.

|| Vol. II. Page 399.

** Consultation, 5th August 1776. Vol. II. Page 405.

that

that when he is persuaded he can bring the punishment home, he will produce offenders, and not till then.

This was the precarious state of the Company's government at Fort St George, when lord Pigot, on the 9th of August 1776, proposed the departure of Mr. Floyer to his station at Masulipatam.

The major part of the Council could not but be apprehensive, that lord Pigot would not hesitate to carry into execution those independent powers which he had repeatedly declared to be vested in himself, on any occasion he might chuse. His lordship was, at that time, supported by three members of the Council. The majority consisted of seven, who had uniformly reprobated the unconstitutional parts of lord Pigot's conduct, and who, from principle and duty, were resolved to prevent him from distressing the Company's government, by an exercise of powers which they knew were not legally, or according to the established customs of the service, vested in him. Mr. Floyer was one of those members, and Sir Robert Fletcher was another.—From the declarations of lord Pigot, as herein before quoted, and from his subsequent conduct in Council to the 9th of August 1776, it was not difficult to perceive that his lordship would not stop there —Sir Robert Fletcher's indisposition had frequently prevented his attendance in Council;—his absence, and that of Mr. Floyer, would, upon the arrival of Mr. Lathom from Cudalore, which happened nearly about that period, have procured his lordship a majority of voices in the Council, which were necessary to enable him to carry his views into execution.—The majority, therefore, detained Mr. Floyer at Madras, until they judged the situation of the Company's affairs there would admit of his repairing to his station at Masulipatam.

Thus Mr. Floyer was again reduced to the necessity of remaining to act as a member in the Council at Madras.

The printed publication of the Company's records have sufficiently demonstrated, that almost every succeeding day produced additional danger to the constitutional rights of the Company's government at Fort St. George, until it became necessary to restrain the author of such impending evils. And the measures subsequently pursued by a

legal majority of the Council, composing the Company's government on the coast of Coromandel, called aloud for the utmost exertion of every individual member of that government.—This consideration further induced the members of that government to detain Mr. Floyer at Madras, after the arrest of lord Pigot, until the close of their first public dispatches to the Court of Directors—Mr. Floyer signed those dispatches on the 2d of October at noon, and took his departure from Madras within five hours after.

In consequence of Mr. Floyer's having first been compelled to give his vote upon the claims in the Tanjore country, and afterwards detained at Madras, in disobedience to the positive orders of the Court of Directors, he was involuntarily made to become a party concerned in the debates and proceedings of the Council; from which a due observance of the orders of the Court of Directors must necessarily have exempted him.

For had Mr. Floyer been permitted to proceed to his station at Masulipatam, agreeable to the very express, pointed, and positive orders of the Court of Directors, and which he so repeatedly solicited, he must have been precisely in the situation of his two colleagues, Mr. Smith and Mr. Johnson, who, by remaining at their respective chiefships of Ganjam and Vizagapatam, during the late transactions at Fort St. George, have been continued members of that government, by the same dispatches from the Company which ordered the recall of Mr. Floyer to England—It being an invariable rule of the service, that a member of Council, whilst he is at his chiefship, or employed on service distant from the Presidency, is not esteemed a responsible member of the government during his absence, or permitted to interfere, in any case whatsoever, in the Company's affairs (the business of his own particular chiefship or department excepted) more than any civil servant of the Company below Council.

Compelled by these circumstances to continue to act as a member in the Council at Fort St. George, Mr. Floyer did, upon the 23d of August, 1776, assent, with six other members of the Council, to the order for putting the fort-house, and garrison of Fort George, in the possession of the majority of Council, and for arresting,

resting, if necessary, the person of lord Pigot; the objects of which order were accomplished the day following—But on the 29th of that month, and long before Mr. Floyer was permitted to depart for Masulipatam, he had also assented to a resolution of Council for liberating lord Pigot from all restraint, on condition that he would reside at any civil subordinate settlement of the Company upon the coast of Coromandel, until their pleasure, respecting those differences could be known, and pledge his word of honour to remain in quietness within the limits of such settlement, or on condition that he would embark for England upon one of the Company's ships.—This resolution was duly signified to his lordship on the 29th of August, 1776; but he thought proper to reject all the propositions therein made.

From hence, then, it is most apparent, that Mr. Floyer, from the first day he took his seat in Council at Madras, was apprehensive of being involved in disputes, of a very serious nature, at the Council; that his being engaged in those disputes was very far from his wishes; and that if lord Pigot had paid a due obedience to the orders of those from whom he derived his authority, Mr. Floyer's name would not have appeared in those disputes—But when he found himself *absolutely* obliged to take a part, he gave his opinions in Council, in conformity to what he deemed the constitution of the Company, reasoning, that if the arbitrary pretensions of lord Pigot to a negative on every resolution of a majority of the Council, should be established as a principle of government, the execution of every order, howsoever important, positive, and express, from the Court of Directors *themselves*, would depend upon the opinion of the President *alone*.



